

From: Richard Sumter/R3/USEPA/US
Sent: 6/25/2012 4:21:15 PM

To: David Sternberg/R3/USEPA/US@EPA; Terri-A White/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
CC:
Subject: Fw: for headlines - OpEd from Congressman Critz

David, just wanted to give you a heads up on Critz's Tribune-Review and Shawn's inquiry.
----- Forwarded by Richard Sumter/R3/USEPA/US on 06/25/2012 04:16 PM -----

From: Richard Sumter/R3/USEPA/US
To: Shawn Garvin/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Catherine Libertz/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 06/25/2012 04:03 PM
Subject: Re: for headlines - OpEd from Congressman Critz

Shawn, if I understand your email correctly,

Ex. 5 - Deliberative

Ex. 5 - Deliberative

Ex. 5 - Deliberative

-- please advise so I can inform my team.

From: Shawn Garvin/R3/USEPA/US
To: Catherine Libertz/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, William Early/R3/USEPA/US
Cc: Richard Sumter/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Jennie Saxe/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, "Dandrea Michael" <dandrea.michael@epa.gov>
Date: 06/25/2012 01:25 PM
Subject: Re: for headlines - OpEd from Congressman Critz

Ex. 5 - Deliberative

Sent by EPA Wireless E-Mail Services

----- Original Message -----

From: Catherine Libertz
Sent: 06/25/2012 12:56 PM EDT
To: Shawn Garvin; William Early
Cc: Richard Sumter
Subject: Fw: for headlines - OpEd from Congressman Critz

Hi, Shawn and Bill. See Critz's (D-PA12) opinion article below from Trib Total media 'Pittsburgh's largest newspaper group' online. I mentioned it at today's senior staff and also sent along to OCIR. Need to find out a little more about the reference to EPA's 'attempt to torpedo the proposed MARC 1 pipeline'. Dave Arnold said he can fill me in. I'll follow up.

Ex. 5 - Deliberative

Will let you know if we get any calls.

Stick to fracking science, not the politics

About The Tribune-Review

The Tribune-Review can be reached [via e-mail](#) or at 412-321-6460.

By Mark S. Critz

Published: Saturday, June 23, 2012, 2:38 p.m.

Updated: Saturday, June 23, 2012

At a recent U.S. Senate Appropriations Committee hearing, Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Lisa Jackson justified the agency's "desire to do additional science around hydraulic fracturing ... because the public's trust in that technology we believe is also based on the belief that we are looking to bring the very best science to bear, to ensure that it remains safe." While no one would argue with the importance of ensuring safety in responsible shale-gas development, recent missteps and questionable actions by the EPA have regrettably cast doubt upon the agency's credibility and ability to put forth the "best science" to ensure the public's trust.

In addition to last month's embarrassing resignation of the EPA's Region 6 administrator for subjectively placing a bull's-eye on the oil and gas industry, the EPA also has shown an anti-gas bias in Pennsylvania with its attempts to torpedo the proposed MARC 1 Pipeline after the project gained approval from the federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

As a result, there is mounting concern that EPA officials are committed to political agendas instead of looking out for the overall best interests of the public.

Additionally, the EPA recently dropped a case in Texas against a company wrongly accused of polluting water wells because of a lack of clear scientific evidence and agreed to retesting water in Wyoming after its methods were questioned.

And on top of this, the EPA recently announced that after conducting its own analysis of drinking water in Dimock, a Pennsylvania town that has become one of the focal points in the hydraulic fracturing debate, no wells with unsafe levels of contamination were tied to hydraulic fracturing.

Fortunately for the American public, EPA's premature conclusions and questionable actions have forced the agency to re-evaluate allegations that hydraulic fracturing has been responsible for environmental contamination. However, the bad news is that through all of this controversy and misinformation on hydraulic fracturing and shale gas, the public has been left holding the bag — with tremendous confusion and concern about the real facts in this debate.

At a time when federal and state regulators continue to seek ways to ensure that natural-gas drilling is done safely, it is imperative that the facts are presented instead of overhyped fears.

Instead of continuing down a path of misinformation that threatens to hinder development of this promising resource, we need to focus on working together to have fact-based discussions that will lead to safe, realistic solutions.

With the huge strides made by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) over the last few generations, there are clear indications that Pennsylvania's hydraulic fracturing regulations are working. And while the EPA has an important role as partners with the state, the agency should avoid stepping into an area that the DEP has a long history of overseeing.

With so much at stake, now is the time for fact-based discussions that will lead to safe and realistic solutions. It is time to raise EPA's level of accountability by sticking to the science and rising above the politics. Working together, we can succeed in safely developing our nation's abundant resources for current needs and for future

generations.

Mark S. Critz represents the 12th Congressional District.

----- Forwarded by Catherine Libertz/R3/USEPA/US on 06/25/2012 12:47 PM -----

From: Jennie Saxe/R3/USEPA/US
To: Roy Seneca/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Catherine Libertz/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, mohollen.laura@epa.gov
Date: 06/25/2012 08:32 AM
Subject: for headlines - OpEd from Congressman Critz

<http://triblive.com/opinion/2055478-74/epa-fracturing-hydraulic-public-science-agency-gas-pennsylvania-based-concern>

Jennie Perey Saxe, Ph.D.
State/Congressional Liaison - Pennsylvania
U.S. EPA Region III
1650 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215-814-5806
saxe.jennie@epa.gov